

REMARKS

Claims 1-12, 23-31 and 36-47 are pending following entry of the amendments herein. The claims have been amended. New claims 42-47 have been added. No new matter has been added.

The Examiner objected to claims 1 and 3 for antecedent basis. The Examiner's objections have been addressed in the amendments to the claims.

ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-12, 28-31 and 38-41 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as anticipated by U.S. Pat. No. 5,454,729 (Wen-Te). Claim 1 recites a receptacle having at least one opening for receiving a blade of a compatible plug and an electrical contact located for contact with one of the blades of the compatible plug. Claim 1 also recites a mating formation pair including a receptacle formation and a corresponding plug formation. The receptacle formation is dimensioned to contact a general-use plug to prevent a blade of the general-use plug from contacting the electrical contact of the receptacle thereby preventing the general-use plug from establishing an electrical connection with the receptacle. The compatible plug defining the plug formation, however, is permitted to establish an electrical connection.

Wen-Te discloses plug and socket assemblies suited for interconnecting strands of Christmas tree lights. (See col. 1, lines 21-45; and col. 3, lines 41-46). The assemblies include retaining means to maintain connection between the plug and socket. The retaining means shown in Figure 3 includes a pin (30) carried by the socket (20) and received by a hole (31) in the plug (10).

There is no disclosure in Wen-Te that the pin (30) is dimensioned to contact a standard plug not defining hole (31) such that there is *no* contact between the blades of the plug and the electrical contacts of the socket, in the manner recited in claim 1. For the foregoing reason, Wen-Te fails to show each and every feature of claim 1. Wen-Te, therefore, does not anticipate claim 1. Furthermore, it would not have been obvious to modify Wen-Te in the

manner claimed in claim 1. The stated purpose of pin (30) is for maintaining connection. There is no teaching in Wen-Te of preventing electrical connection between a plug and socket.

Each of claims 2-12, and 41 depends from claim 1 and, therefore, is not anticipated by Wen-Te for the same reasons as claim 1. Each of claims 2-6 recites that the receptacle formation is a projection extending to a height from the receptacle that is greater than the length of an overlapping contact that results between a blade of a compatible plug and an electrical contact of the receptacle following full insertion of the compatible plug. There is no disclosure in Wen-Te that the pin (30) provides this feature. For this additional reason, therefore, in addition to the above reasons for claim 1, claims 2-6 are not anticipated by Wen-Te.

Each of claims 7-11 recites that the receptacle formation and plug formation of the mating formation pair are respectively defined by an opening of the receptacle and a blade of the plug. There is no disclosure of this feature in Wen-Te. For this additional reason, therefore, in addition to the above reasons for claim 1, claims 7-11 are not anticipated by Wen-Te.

Claim 28 recites a receptacle comprising an electrical contact to deliver current to a corresponding electrical contact of a compatible plug. The receptacle also comprises a projection extending to a height from the receptacle that is greater than the length of an overlapping contact that results between a contact of the compatible plug and the contact of the receptacle following full insertion of the compatible plug.

There is no disclosure in Wen-Te that the pin (30) is dimensioned in the manner required by claim 28. For this reason, Wen-Te, fails to show each and every feature of claim 28 and, therefore, fails to anticipate claim 28. Each of claims 29-31 depends from claim 28 and, therefore, is not anticipated by Wen-Te for the same reasons as claim 28.

Claim 38 recites a face member for use with a receptacle including a body defining at least one opening for receipt of a blade of a compatible plug. Claim 38 also recites a receptacle formation presented by the body forming a mating formation pair with a corresponding plug formation presented by the compatible plug. The receptacle formation is dimensioned to contact a non-compatible plug to prevent a blade of the non-compatible plug from contacting an electrical contact of the receptacle.

Again, there is no disclosure in Wen-Te that the pin (30) is dimensioned to contact a standard plug not defining hole (31) such that there is *no* contact between the blades of the plug and the electrical contacts of the receptacle, in the manner claimed in claim 38. Wen-Te, therefore, does not anticipate claim 38.

Claim 39 recites a lighting system comprising a receptacle and a plug respectively defining a receptacle formation and a corresponding plug formation of a mating formation pair. The receptacle formation is dimensioned to contact a general-use plug to prevent a blade of the general-use plug from contacting an electrical contact of the receptacle. Claim 39 further recites that the plug formation is visible when the plug and receptacle are fully engaged with each other.

Again, there is no disclosure in Wen-Te that the pin (30) is dimensioned to contact a standard plug not defining hole (31) such that there is *no* contact between the blades of the plug and the electrical contacts of the receptacle in the manner claimed in claim 39. Also, the pin (30) will not be visible when the socket and compatible plug are fully engaged with each other in the manner claimed in claim 39.

For the foregoing reasons, Wen-Te does not anticipate claim 39. Claim 40 depends from claim 39 and, therefore, is not anticipated by Wen-Te for the same reasons as claim 39.

For the foregoing reasons, the applicants respectfully request that the rejection of claims 1-12, 28-31 and 38-41 based on Wen-Te be withdrawn.

Claims 23-27 and 36-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious based on U.S. Patent No. 4,293,733 (Royer) and Wen-Te.

Claim 23 recites a receptacle unit including a first receptacle complying with a general-use industry standard configuration and a second receptacle. Claim 23 also recites a mating formation pair including a receptacle formation and a corresponding plug formation respectively carried by the second receptacle and a compatible plug. The receptacle formation of claim 23 is dimensioned to contact a general-use plug to prevent an electrical contact of the general-use plug from contacting an electrical contact of the second receptacle.

Royer discloses an electrical outlet having a protective safety cover. Royer is cited by the Examiner as showing first and second receptacles. The Examiner acknowledges that

Royer fails to disclose a mating formation pair and cites Wen-Te as teaching a mating formation pair.

As discussed above, there is no teaching or suggestion in Wen-Te that the pin (30) is dimensioned to contact a standard plug not defining hole (31) such that there is *no* contact between the blades of the plug and the electrical contacts of the receptacle, in the manner claimed in claim 23.

Each of claims 24-27 depends from claim 23 and, therefore, is not rendered obvious from Royer and Wen-Te for the same reasons as claim 23. Claims 25 and 26 further recite that the receptacle formation is a projection extending to a height from the receptacle that is greater than the length of an overlapping contact that results between a blade of a compatible plug and an electrical contact of the receptacle following full insertion of the compatible plug. There is no teaching in Wen-Te that the pin (30) provides this feature. For this additional reason, therefore, in addition to the above reasons for claim 23, claims 25 and 26 are not rendered obvious from Royer and Wen-Te.

Claim 36 recites an electrical distribution system comprising at least one general-use receptacle and at least one other receptacle. The general-use receptacle complies with an industry standard configuration and arranged to receive a corresponding general-use plug. The system also includes a mating formation pair including a receptacle formation and a plug formation respectively carried by the at least one other receptacle and a compatible plug. The receptacle formation dimensioned to contact a general-use plug to prevent a blade of the general-use plug from contacting an electrical contact of the at least one other receptacle.

Again, there is no teaching or suggestion in Wen-Te that the pin (30) is dimensioned to contact a standard plug not defining hole (31) such that there is *no* contact between the blades of the plug and the electrical contacts of the receptacle, in the manner claimed in claim 36.

For the foregoing reasons, claim 36 is not rendered obvious from Royer and Wen-Te. Claim 37 depends from claim 36 and, therefore, is not rendered obvious from Royer and Wen-Te for the same reasons as claim 36.

For the foregoing reasons, the applicants request that the rejection of claims 23-27 and 36-37 based on Royer and Wen-Te be withdrawn.

It is submitted that the application is now in condition for allowance. If the Examiner believes that direct communication would advance prosecution, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

JASON O. ADAMS, *et al.*

BY: 

GREGORY J. LAVORGNA

Registration No. 30,469

Drinker Biddle & Reath LLP

One Logan Square

18th and Cherry Streets

Philadelphia, PA 19103-6996

Tel: 215-988-3309

Fax: 215-988-2757

Attorney for Applicants